The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. IX:6, X:I *"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."* Dec., 1959 - Feb., 1960

New York City Festival Planning Three-Play Season

Although financial arrangements at the present moment are far from complete, Joseph Papp the indefatiguable originator of the free Shakespeare Festival in New York City is going ahead with plans to produce **Henry V, Measure for Measure,** and **The Taming of the Shrew.** Scheduled dates for the three plays are June 29, July 24, and August 18. There will be no repertory; each play will run for about three weeks. Respective directors are Stuart Vaughan, Alan Schneider, and Gerald A. Freedman.

As of this writing about $40,000 of the necessary $110,000 had already been received from foundations and individual donors. Mr. Papp expects to raise most of the money by $7.50 subscriptions which will entitle donors to an advance showing of each play.

After the wide approval given to the Festival last year the City of New York appropriated $250,000 to build a permanent site for the outdoor theatre. The site however will not be ready until the 1961 season. Patrons and donors have been requested to send tax-deductible donations to the New York Shakespeare Festival at 1230 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C.

Rare Edition of Shakespeare Biography Presented to Yale's Elizabethan Club

Two years ago Professor James M. Osborn saw **The Life of Mr. William Shakespeare** dated 1743 in a bookseller's Catalogue and knew that the bookseller's description of "excessively rare" was an understatement. Professor Osborn dispelled a preliminary opinion inclining to the idea of forgery when another copy was located in the Birmingham Shakespeare Library. No other copies are known to exist.

The **Life** as printed follows Pope's version of Nicholas Rowe rather carefully "even to some accidentals," but there are some differences, chiefly in paragraphing. Because the title page mentions the newly unveiled monument to Shakespeare in Westminster Abbey, Professor Osborn thinks that the life was pirated to be sold in that time of great public interest.

The volume has been presented to the Elizabethan Club at Yale in memory of the late Carl H. Pforzheimer, another noted collector.

Reynolds on King Lear

In the September issue of **SNL,** p. 30, the paper entitled "King Lear at the Globe" was attributed to Hardin Craig in error. Actually George F. Reynolds, Professor Emeritus at the University of Colorado was the author. Prof. Craig was honored by a banquet, but the lecture was an honor he dreamt not of.

See Editorial Announcement

Canadian Stratford Offer History, Comedy, and Tragedy

Michael Langham, Artistic Director of the Stratford Shakespearean Festival of Stratford, Canada, has announced **King John, Romeo and Juliet,** and **A Midsummer Night's Dream** as the three plays for the 8th annual festival. The season will run from June 27 to September 17.

The noted Shakespeare actor and now Broadway and TV star Christopher Plummer has been engaged to play Faulconbridge and Mercutio. Bruno Gerussi is to play Romeo with Julie Harris as Juliet.

Because of the illness of Dr. Tyrone Guthrie, Douglas Seale has been secured to direct **King John** - the play which Mr. Seale directed at the Stratford Memorial Theatre in 1957. Mr. Langham himself will direct **Romeo and Juliet** and Douglas Campbell will direct **A Midsummer Night's Dream.**

As in the past years, there will also be cultural programs of opera, music, and films. **H.M.S. Pinafore** will be directed by Tyrone Guthrie; there will be concerts by The National Festival Orchestra - adjudged one of the finest in the country, and an International Conference of composers. An exhibition of paintings of the Western Canadian Indians will also be seen.

American Shakespeare Festival to Star Miss Hepburn

Twelfth Night, Antony and Cleopatra, and another as yet unselected play are scheduled for performance at the American Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Connecticut, when it opens early in June. Full plans were not available, but Katharine Hepburn is slated to appear in both the above named plays. Jack Landau the new Director of the Festival expects to announce the third play shortly. An early opening of the season, probably June 8th, is planned.

MEMORIAL THEATRE OPENS NEW DECADE WITH 6 PLAYS

If the Shakespearean world was waiting to find what startling innovations twenty-nine year old Peter Hall would introduce under his new directorship of the internationally famous Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, the answer is now at hand. A six play series tracing the development, range, and paradox of Shakespearean comedy is to be offered with the following plays offered in evidence: **The Two Gentlemen of Verona** (April 5), **The Merchant of Venice** (April 12), **Twelfth Night** (May 17), **The Taming of the Shrew** (June 21), **Troilus and Cressida** (July 26), and **The Winter's Tale** (August 30).

From early romance, through romance mixed with realism and farce, through the satirical, cynical and almost tragic **T & C,** to the **Winter's Tale** with its near tragedy ending in pastoral happiness, the six plays are expected to throw light on the contrasting comic tones in Shakespeare's repertoire.

Peter Hall will direct **TG of V** and **TN,** Hall and John Barton (Assistant Director) will direct **T & C,** Barton himself will direct the **Shrew,** Michael Langham (Canada's Director) will direct **The M of V,** and Peter Wood will direct **The Winter's Tale.** A company of forty-five headed by Peggy Ashcroft, Dorothy Tutin, Harry Andrews, Patrick Wymark, and many others has been engaged.

Renaissance Text Group Organized

An organization for the publication of unique and rare non-dramatic texts from the period 1500 to 1660 was organized at a conference during the MLA meeting in Chicago on December 29, 1959. Although an editorial policy and constitution are planned for presentation at the 1960 MLA meeting in Philadelphia, plans are already under way to formulate a preliminary list of titles and appropriate editors. Ernest Sirluck of the University of Chicago was elected Chairman of the organizing committee of which Samuel Schoenbaum of Northwestern is Secretary. Also on the committee are R. C. Bald (Chicago), Fredson Bowers (Va.), Hugh G. Dick (UCLA), William A. Jackson (Harvard), Francis R. Johnson (Stanford), Louis L. Martz (Yale), James G. McManaway (Folger), William A. Ringler, Jr. (Washington U), and Matthias A. Shaaber (Pennsylvania). Prospective members are invited to send their names to the Chairman along with any suggestions as to organization, desirable titles, editorial policy, and finance.

Three Volume Shakespeare Bibliography Nearing Completion

The first volume of the Shakespeare Bibliography being readied for the press by Gordon Ross Smith of Pennsylvania State University (former **SNL** bibliographer) is planned for publication in late 1960.

Between 15 and 17 thousand items will cover the period from 1936 (the year which the last Ebisch and Schucking Supplement covered) to 1958. The total work is comprised mainly of the contents of 435 separate bibliographies such as those in the **Shakespeare Association Bulletin, Shakespeare Quarterly, Shakespeare Jahrbuch,** and the relevant portions of **PMLA Studies in Philology, Modern Humanities Research Association, The Year's Work in English Studies,** and so on. Each of these has recorded items missed by the others. Bibliographies of dissertation of the U.S.A., England, France, Germany, and Austria have also been included, along with other lists of the Scandinavian and Low Countries.

The six page section of **E & S** on Shakespeare and the Modern Stage has been enormously expanded and will be of much use to those interested in modern Shakespeare production.

For the period after 1958 Dr. Smith intends to continue compiling and to publish supplements every ten years.

Folger Readers at MLA

Approximately twenty - five scholars who have worked or are working at the Folger Shakespeare Library gathered at a dinner during the Modern Language Association meeting in Chicago on Dec. 28 and heard Dr. Louis B. Wright, Director of the Library, speak on the growing facilities and amenities of the library. The wide range of the Library was emphasized and its present plans to increase its holdings in the Italian Renaissance were outlined. Prof. John L. Lievsay of the University of Tennessee has been engaged to foster this special interest. The new monographs that the Library is issuing on various aspects of Tudor and Stuart civilization were praised. Prof. Wright mentioned the new addition to the Library and the sun deck that will soon be available for relaxation. The Library's international status is being emphasized by entertaining visiting scholars from Great Britain and the continent.

Rev. James F. Larkin, C.S.V., of De Paul University organized the meeting. Professor Virgil B. Heltzel of Northwestern in his capacity as Host introduced Professor Wright.

Thomas Marc Parrott 1867 - 1960

As we went to press we learned with deep regret of the death on February 5 of Thomas Marc Parrott, Professor Emeritus of Princeton University at the age of 93. Details in April **SNL.**

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER
Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent, Ohio
Six issues annually - Feb., April, May, Sept. Nov., Dec. - Annual Subscription $1.50
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. IX: No. 6 December, 1959
Vol. X: No. 1 February, 1960

"I have not much importuned you . . . "

Some of the hundreds of correspondents with whom I have discussed the problems of publishing **The Shakespeare Newsletter** know that the last nine years have not been easy ones. For about a year and a half I wrote everything myself. Later there were Contributing Editors. But the chief editorial problem - the farming out of the articles and the making of a **Newsletter** from loose sheets of paper has been ours alone. Doing the work has always been interesting, but doing it under financial pressure has been burdensome.

The problem has been to find printers whose price was within the realm which would permit **SNL** to exist within its limitations. To make a long story short - as printers raised their prices, rather than raise the price to subscribers, I changed printers. The sixth printer - the printer of this issue - has now given me up. Altruism is wonderful, Shakespeare is a noble cause, but business is business. Printer number seven begins in April.

One does not have to be a specialist in economics to know that an increase in the cost of subscription would have alleviated many of the problems of the past nine years. Many of the magazines to which we subscribe and the associations to which we all belong have doubled and almost tripled in cost in the decade during which I have struggled to maintain the dollar rate. With all of us - the problem is survival, not profit.

I hope that every subscriber will feel that if the **Newsletter** is worth a dollar, it is also worth eight cents more per issue at a new annual subscription rate of $1.50 per year. I am not going to promise a fifty percent increase in the size of the **Newsletter** because then we would be right back where we started from. BUT if there is enough money on hand, readers may rest assured that I will print extra pages when possible.

Arrears may of course be sent in at the old rate. Renewals would be appreciated for intervals of at least two years. If there is any doubt, send in whatever you wish and the amount will be added and your expiration date properly extended. May I remind readers as I have said before - the **Newsletter** is a hobby not a business. Bringing out new issues is interesting. It is the repetitive tasks that present the burdens. Our worst chore is to remind readers that their subscription is past due - we have done it only **three times in nine years.** All I ask is that you watch the expiration date that appears adjacent to your name on the address plate. The first number is the month, the second the year. My usual policy is never to cancel a subscription without notification from the subscriber. If this procedure is unorthodox, I can only plead that there is only one of me for hundreds of you.

At Kent State University during its Semi-Centennial Celebration, Nov. 18, 1959.
Schiller, Shakespeare, and the Literature of Power
Stephen Spender, Cambridge

Translating Schiller's **Mary Stuart** showed the strong influence of Shakespeare on the German dramatist. But Shakespeare has a dimension of imagery which Schiller almost entirely lacks. Shakespeare's characters are on a shelf of reality from which they plunge suddenly into a world of imagination - a universal world. Beyond the plunge is a sea floor covered with pearls from which the character plucks one and it becomes an object of delight in itself. "To be or not to be . . ." is not the same as the lines "I lack advancement." From the horror of the confrontation of death we get suffering of slings and arrows. Schiller's characters take no such plunges; they do not become lost in universalized situations. Rhetoric they have, but not in a moment discovered to be universally true. Schiller's characters keep away from the abyss and stay close to the ideas involved. Schiller writes tansparent poetry in which the language is a magnifying glass which lends luminosity. Schiller is not inferior to Shakespeare, merely different. His heroes are idealists and their tragedy is the defeat of their ideals.

In Shakespeare's histories, the role of the hero is to fulfill destiny. People are inferior to kings, children to fathers; this is the landscape in which they function. Shakespeare emphasizes that to be immoral is to be natural - against nature. RIII is a bastard, born outside nature in an unnatural shape. This is reflected in his action. Falstaff is overthrown naturally, when Hal becomes king. Shakespeare does not concentrate on ideals, but on the nature and being of the king. He disects their nature not their ideas. They have dreams, not ideals. Lady Macbeth, even if she does repent off stage, is a monster. Cleopatra practices every vice under the sun, but she maintains her royalty. The king must maintain his vocation; that is all that is necessary of him. Schiller would have disqualified Lear, but Shakespeare felt that he was maintaining his essential vocation. Those who are taking advantage of him are the monsters.

Shakespeare changes history, but a completely accurate play would be boring. **Julius Caesar** would have been better if Shakespeare could have imagined himself to have been in Rome. Coriolanus is better because in him Shakespeare was thinking of Essex.

To Shakespeare power equals great vocation ordained by or suited to nature plus material resources (the land and power which Lear disposes of foolishly). For Schiller, power equals recognition of the steps necessary to gain or retain power plus the resources which are put into one's hands through abstract grasp of historic necessity. The fusion of virtue and great power is the greatest good in the world. Power is not dangerous in Shakespeare except when used unnaturally. To Shakespeare, the ruler was the ruler. But by Schiller's time many rulers had lost their heads so the good king was the one who could keep his head.

Schiller is currently under a cloud in England as a failed Shakespeare. In Germany he is under a cloud as a failed Goethe.

Shakespeare at the Phoenix, N. Y. C.

The off Broadway Phoenix Theatre is offering **I Henry IV** beginning March 1. Stuart Vaughan (director of the free N. Y. C. Shakespeare Festival) is resident director. To encourage student participation the date was changed so as not to conflict with the Easter vacation.

"Birthplace" and "Cottage" Replicas

Visitors to Victoria, Canada, rub their eyes in disbelief. Believe it or not, they see Shakespeare's Birthplace and Ann Hathaway's Cottage before their eyes.

It all began when Sam Lane and his wife Rosini left England with 14,000 pounds of antiques, bought a 55 year old "Tudor" house, and opened the "Old England Inn." To give it more atmosphere, they built on the grounds a replica of Shakespeare's Birthplace which they use as their home. Not content, they also built a model of Ann Hathaway's Cottage, reproduced from drawings and measurements of the original. Both buildings are furnished as closely as possible in the style of the original period. The Cottage cost $70,000 and is thatched with ten tons of straw.

For added interest the staff of the Inn wear Elizabethan costume during the busy summer season. After tiring of the amenities of the Inn and replicas, visitors may visit the world's largest totem pole, also in Victoria.

Sample of London Stage, 1660 - 1800

The editor has a few copies of preliminary gatherings from the long awaited **London Stage 1660 - 1800** soon to be published by the Southern Illinois University Press. Subscribers may have a copy on request.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912. AND MARCH 3. 1933 OF THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER published six times per year, Feb., Apr., May, Sept., Nov., Dec., at Kent, Ohio for December 31st, 1958.

State of Ohio
County of Portage

Before, me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Louis Marder, who having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the publisher of the Shakespeare Newsletter and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher—Louis Marder, Kent, Ohio
Editor Louis Marder, Kent, Ohio
Managing Editor—Louis Marder, Kent, Ohio
Business Manager—Louis Marder, Kent, Ohio

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)—None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is: (This information is required from daily publications only.)

LOUIS MARDER, Owner

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 8th day of February, 1960.

MARGARET A. SCHMIEDL
Notary Public

My Commission Expires July 23, 1962.

SHAKESPEARE AT THE 74TH MLA, CHICAGO

Palmer House, Dec. 27-29, 1959

Directions in Shakespeare's Use of Wordplay—Love's Labour's Lost

Marvin Spevack, City College of N. Y.

Although Shakespeare's wordplay is considered by some to be mainly a demonstration of his so-called "delight in words" and by others to be a mere excrescence, close examination of the plays reveals a discriminating artistic purpose. As early as **Love's Labour's Lost** the directions of his functional use of wordplay are outlined. Along with other devices, wordplay helps establish the tone of a play, is correlated with and enforces aspects of the dramatic action, and contributes to the delineation of character.

In romantic comedies the very torrent of puns reflects the sparkling and playful nature of the social entanglements. Further, since puns are most often part of a contest, they are a perfect medium to express the amorous give-and-take, for they embody the paradox in love-game comedy of an underlying love cloaked in a seeming hostility. Thus the jousts provide the warring-wooing lovers with a common ground (or, more properly, battleground) and vocabulary for social intercourse; they attract, identify, and bind the participants; they often embody a yardstick of common sense; and they keep the game—which is the action—going. At times, too, wordplay enables a character to overcome social strictures and lay bare strata of consciousness. This is to be Shakespeare's way increasingly throughout his career—sheer play giving way to evidence of inner unrest.

Also the number of puns may be correlated with the nature of the action. Generally, it increases as the momentum of the action increases—in romantic comedies, for example, it usually reaches a high point in the grand engagement before the final graceful yielding—and decreases sharply or stops completely when love's labor's won.

And, finally, since the characters live a kind of verbal predatory existence, it makes all the difference how abundant, extended, and resourceful wordplay is. Thus the brightest people are characterized, among other ways, by their number of puns and their success in verbal duels. And others are characterized by the very nature of their wordplay, as well as its frequency. The lumbering pedant Holofernes, for instance, is depicted not only by his relative lack of punning but also by the particularly labored variety he produces.

Thus, the excesses in **Love's Labour's Lost** notwithstanding, it is clear—especially if we project ourselves into the plays which follow—that the foundation is being laid for a purposive, sensitive, and skillful technique.

The Rape of Lucrece and Shakespearean Tregedy

Harold R. Walley, Ohio State University

Despite modern prejudices toward the poem, "The Rape of Lucrece" is important "in the formulation of Shakespeare's fundamental dramatic principles and practices." This discursive poem devotes less than a third of its 1855 lines to actual narrative; the remaining space to "excessive bouts of lamentation, gratuitous . . . moralizing, . . digressions, rhetorical exhibitionism, and just plain padding." Though the meagre action is not presented dramatically, **Lucrece** examines the nature of tragedy, analyzes psychological factors, explores the nature of evil, and "arrives at an attitude toward tragic experience which permeates the whole pattern of Shakespeare's mature thought."

The structure of the poem may be divided into three major sections: the first culminating in the act of rape (693 Il.), the second dealing with the impact on those involved (889 Il.), and the third swiftly recounting the catastrophe and conclusion (273 Il.). Shakespeare emphasizes the middle section as the true heart of the tragedy. The plight of the victim, her agonized suffering, and her lamentations raise vital questions on the nature of life—questions which are answered in Lucrece's three formal imprecations against Night, Opportunity, and Time. "Essentially, **Lucrece** is an examination of what constitutes tragedy, and an explanation of how it operates." This rationale underlies the whole of Shakespearean tragedy and is set forth explicitly for the first time in **Lucrece.**

Authoritarian Patterns in Shakespeare's Coriolanus

Gordon Ross Smith, Penna. State University

The character of Coriolanus shows many parallels to the authoritarian character syndrome outlined by Erich Fromm in **Escape from Freedom** and subsequently empirically verified by the studies of T. W. Adorno and his associates in **The Authoritarian Personality.** The chief parallels are the identification with an external authority for the sake of bolstering the inner sense of weakness, tendencies to masochism, sadism, and self-glorification, betrayal of the idolized authority when it fails to support the authoritarian individual, a rough, pseudo-masculine facade, absence of introspection and of principle, intolerance of ambiguity, sense of victimization and denial of fault, and the absence of insight into the character or motives of other people. The extremes of feminine authoritarian character are seen as caricatured in Volumnia and Virgilia. There are reasons to doubt that Aufidius, the tribunes, or most of the populace are authoritarian. That Shakespeare himself could not have been authoritarian is asserted on two grounds: first, that Coriolanus is portrayed as non-authoritarians see them, not as authoritarians see themselves, and second, that empirical studies indicate the essentially unpoetic authoritarian mind could not have produced such poetry as Shakespeare's. Finally, the manner in which this interpretation can be understood to fit into the development of Shakespeare's political thought and also into the attitudes of the Jacobean public theatre audience is explained.

[The foregoing is an abstract of the full paper as it appears in **Literature and Psychology,** IX: 3-4 (Summer-Fall 1959), 45-51. Only a part was presented at the MLA.]

Commentary on Spevack & Walley

R. H. Goldsmith, Emory & Henry College

Although a quibble may have had some malignant power over Shakespeare's mind, as Dr. Johnson regrets, the poet learned to curb his propensity for punning in his later plays. To see the pun as touchstone to Shakespeare's comic development is to take bird-bolts for cannon-bullets and to confuse means with ends. Prof. Spevack's study of Shakespeare's use of wordplay in **L. L. L.** is revealing, but it does not sufficiently stress the high humor of character, comic situation, and pervasive irony.

Shakespeare's brightest comedies are comedies about love, its distortions and aberrations, and for this **L. L. L.** points the way. It is not only a play of gay badinage; it is also a serious criticism of an absurd affectation which would leave love and women out of its world.

Prof. Walley's paper is a detailed study of the structure and tragic action in "The Rape of Lucrece." It gives one reason to restudy this sometimes forgotten poem. But some of Dr. Walley's generalizations about the connection between **Lucrece** and Shakespeare's conception of tragedy in the later plays are sweeping and would require more space to substantiate. Lucrece, as tragic protagonist, has one flaw, according to Prof. Goldsmith—her cautious concern for her good name. In fearing a slandered reputation more than the reality of a lost chastity, Lucrece participates in the sin she abhors. For this she suffers and must die anyway.

THE LAUREL SHAKESPEARE SERIES

Francis Fergusson, General Editor

Especially designed for classroom use—the handsome play-per-volume series which offers the largest type and most readable page in any inexpensive modern Shakespeare edition. Texts are recently completed restorations of the original folios by Charles Jasper Sisson of the Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-on-Avon. Each volume contains an original commentary by a noted critic, actor or director of Shakespearean theater and an essay by Professor Fergusson, plus detailed introduction, glossary notes and suggestions for further reading.

Plays now available and their commentators are:

HAMLET	Maurice Evans
TAMING OF THE SHREW	Margaret Webster
ROMEO AND JULIET	W. H. Auden
HENRY IV: Part I	Ralph Richardson
THE WINTER'S TALE	D. A. Traversi
OTHELLO	John Houseman
AS YOU LIKE IT	Esme Church
RICHARD III	Stuart Vaughan
MERCHANT OF VENICE	Morris Carnovsky
JULIUS CAESAR	Philip Lawrence
MACBETH	Flora Robson
TWELFTH NIGHT	E. Martin Browne

Coming In August: MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING and A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

Coming In November: KING LEAR and SONNETS

each volume only 35c

For a complete catalogue of Dell Laurel Editions, please write Educational Dept., DELL BOOKS, 750 Third Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

International Shakespeare Conference at Stratford

SHAKESPEARE AND MARSTON
A. Jose Axelrad, University of Lille, France

Chairman: Professor G. E. Bentley, Princeton

Professor Axelrad described the extent to which the study of such a satirist and playwright as John Marston was of use to the literary historian, who could mistake common features of a literary period for personal and special characteristics. Marston did not create new drama, but took it as he found it and flavoured it with his own boisterous personality. He produced city comedies, tragedies of blood and revenge, extravagant, exotic in the popular fashion, but all his plays were satirical, attacking bourgeois morality in the city comedies, and women at all times. His only play upon a virtuous woman **Sophonisba** was subtitled **The Wonder of Woman.** One of the earliest English tragi-comedies, **The Malcontent,** was original and well-plotted. The melancholy man was a popular figure, and Iago's lines on women were indebted to the malcontent, but only Marston made such a melancholy man the centre of a play.

Shakespeare must have known Marston, and was presumably on Marston's side in the war of the theatres, but actual indebtedness was slight. Perhaps Shakespeare's scene between Hamlet, Gertrude and the Ghost, where two scenes merged as one, owed this development to a comparable scene in **Antonio's Revenge.** Similarly Professor Muir had shown the indebtedness of lines in Macbeth to Marston's **Sophonisba.** Marston did not appear to have borrowed from Shakespeare or been influenced by him, yet the two dramatists had much in common. They began by sharing the Elizabethan love of blood, or revenge, of complex sub-plotting. But whereas Shakespeare grew out of **Titus Andronicus,** Marston never outgrew such effects. Shakespeare could endow characters with reality, and probe their souls. Marston could contrive plots, but his characters were wooden. Shakespeare took a little from Marston, but Marston, who had so much to learn from Shakespeare, took nothing. Shakespeare was a born man of the theatre, Marston was not, and remained a ruffian poet, mistaking filth for fun, lust for love.

Discussion.

Professor G. E. Bentley introduced the discussion of both papers by asking Professor Price to substantiate his view that Shakespeare's early plays were not particularly Christian. It was Professor Price's opinion that Shakespeare in his depiction of a religious man, for instance Titus Andronicus or the Friar in **Romeo and Juliet,** shows up the weakness of their beliefs. Equally Henry VI, the only true Christian in the three parts, is an impossible king. Mr. J. Crow thought it deplorable that Professor Price should take snippets out of Shakespeare to provide his case, rather as one might take thirteen texts out of holy writ and propound a religion from them. An exhilarating exchange followed on the mishearing of "take" as "fake". Mr. Crow emphasized the danger of assuming that the extant evidence is the total evidence, a point illustrated earlier by Professor F. P. Wilson, who reminded us that Shakespeare knew more about his own predecessors than we know now. Dr. G. Wickham thought that more attention should be given to the influence of the actors and their developing art upon the dramatists. In his experience the characters in such plays as **James IV** and **Edward II** were within the compass of amateur actors to an extent that **Othello** and **King Lear** were not.

Professor M. Mincoff agreed with Dr. Wickham and stressed that there must have been a mutual development of both Elizabethan playwrighting and acting technique.

Professor C. Leech wondered whether the morning's lecturers had assumed too great a gulf between Shakespeare and his contemporaries. For instance, Professor Price found no true drama in Shakespeare's predecessors, yet the **Spanish Tragedy** had prolongation, suspense and postponement necessary to true dramatic intensity, while **Edward II** was a carefully articulated piece of dramatic writing. Similarly, he thought Professor Axelrad had minimized Marston's stature: did not the Prologue to **Antonio's Revenge** usher in the tragedy of the whole Jacobean period - the tragedy of the individual, of the heart "Pierc't through with anguish".

SHAKESPEARE AND FLETCHER
Clifford Leech, University of Durham

Chairman: Dr. Zdenek Stribrny, Academy of Science, Prague

Professor Leech noted that collaboration between dramatists characterised the theatrical world of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and that apart from a mutual influence between Shakespeare and Fletcher there is the possibility of actual collaboration between the two men. The evidence for such collaboration is strong and involves three plays: **The Two Noble Kinsmen,** the lost **Cardenio,** and **Henry VIII. The Two Noble Kinsmen** published with the names of Fletcher and Shakespeare on the title page, contain, in Professor Leech's view, many passages so palpably echoic of Shakespeare that it is impossible to credit him with their authorship, and at the same time some relationship with Fletcher's **Bonduca.** The current opinion which sees Shakespeare's hand in two scenes of the **Two Noble Kinsmen** was not disputed by Professor Leech, but to him the major impression left by the play is a Fletcherian one, - an impression depending upon the characteristic differences between the writings of Fletcher and Shakespeare.

This difference may be seen in the different methods adopted by the two playwrights in presenting "the double view". Shakespeare was deeply conscious that a person, idea, or situation could be simultaneously apprehended from two or more points of view, whereas in Fletcherian drama, the double view of things depends upon alternation rather than simultaneity of presentment.

The case for collaboration in **Cardenio** is much more complicated, but as with the **Two Noble Kinsmen,** we may have a play to which Shakespeare made some contribution while the total effect is closer to Fletcher's work. The play's existence is known only from references in the Court Records and the Stationer's Registers, where it is attributed to Shakespeare and Fletcher. It has, however, been identified as the probable original of the **Double Falsehood** which was published by Theobald in 1728. Professor Leech saw suggestions of Shakespeare's style in the first half of the play with the probability of Fletcher characteristically employing Shakespearean reminiscenses in the play's ending

In **Henry VIII** the shares of the two dramatists are not easily separated, and it would appear that in this case Shakespeare and Fletcher worked in close association. Professor Leech emphasized, however, that we have no contemporary evidence to support the idea of Fletcher's hand in the play; yet, continued Professor Leech,

> "I would suggest that **Henry VIII** shares with **The Two Noble Kinsmen** that characteristic of Fletcher's workmanship that I have previously mentioned. As we consider the play, we are not conscious of different layers of meaning, through which we penetrate one by one until we have a sense of a complexity that enfolds all the layers we have reached. Rather we have the sense that at different moments we are offered differing views of the play's events and characters:"

Professor Leech questioned Thorndike's suggestion that in **Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale,** and **The Tempest,** Shakespeare was indebted to the Beaumont and Fletcher dramatic genre represented by **Philaster** and **Bonduca.** However, we can be sure that **The Tempest** shows Shakespeare in Fletcher's debt: particularly when we compare Shakespeare's play with **The Faithful Shepherdess.** Not only are there points of contact between the two plays in situations, location and characters but also there is a strong concern in both plays with the preservation of virginity. Professor Leech concluded by doubting whether any one would claim that any one of the Shakespeare and Fletcher collaborations represents the best work of either. They were men of noticeably different casts of mind - neither could be at his best in the other's tracks. "Our image of Shakespeare will be truer if we do not put out of our minds the closeness of his relationship with Fletcher in the last years of his working life".

Discussion

Professor J. F. Kermode wondered if both **The Faithful Shepherdess** and **The Tempest** might not derive equally from a more general tradition, related to the scenarii of the commedia dell'arte, and perhaps also to a submerged English tradition similar to the Italian, and which included such plays as **Mucedorus.** Professor Leech agreed substantially with this, as with Professor A. C. Sprague's reference to relationship between **A Midsummer Night's Dream** and **The Faithful Shepherdess,** but thought other similarities persisted. Professor Leech drew a distinction between the remembrance by Shakespeare of earlier verbal habits. Part of the discussion was concerned with Theabald's claim to have possessed four manuscripts of **The Double Falsehood.** Professor F. P. Wilson thought it strange that Theobald knew nothing of entries which would have helped his case, and made no reference to the matter in his complete Shakespeare. Professor Leech agreed about difficulties, but thought a lost Jacobean original must have been seen. Professor T. J. B. Spencer remarked that Theobald died before being able to present an intended edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, and Mr. E. Honigmann commented on the difficulty of Theobald's position when challenged. He could scarcely have owned all the volumes and MSS. referred to by him, but his statements were not necessarily to be dismissed. Professor Muir wondered if Theobald became more sceptical over the years.

Additional Papers in April

. . . I am always happy to meet persons who perceive the transcendent superiority of Shakespeare over all other writers.

Ralph Waldo Emerson

Tolstoy on Shakespeare

I remember the astonishment I felt when I first read Shakespeare. I had expected to receive a great esthetic pleasure, but on reading, one after another, the works regarded as his best, **King Lear, Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet,** and **Macbeth,** not only did I not experience pleasure but I felt an insuperable repulsion and tedium, and a doubt whether I lacked sense, since I considered works insignificant and simply bad, which are regarded as the summit of perfection by the whole educated world; or whether the importance that educated world attributed to Shakespeare's works lacks sense . . . . [The characters] are placed in tragic positions which are quite impossible . . . . All his characters speak, not a language of their own but always one and the same Shakespearean, affected, unnatural . . . . [they] say what is not merely unnatural to them but quite unnecessary . . . .

Shakespeare and the Drama, 1906

LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

Edited by Edmund Creeth, Univ. of Michigan

SHAKESPEARE'S IMAGERY AND WHAT IT TELLS US

Caroline F. E. Spurgeon

(Cambridge, Eng. (1935), 355 pp. plus charts)

The Revelation of the Man

Using the figurative imagery of the plays and poems as Polonius uses Reynaldo, we may spy into the personality of Shakespeare. His images are distinct in content from those of Bacon as well as of other Elizabethan dramatists. Favorite sources of metaphor and simile are external nature (most often from the gardener's point of view), daily indoor life, classes of men. Images drawn from town life, literature not classical or biblical, exploration and adventure are rare. Shakespeare habitually invests images with motion: "the visiting moon," "pluck allegiance from men's hearts," "No vessel can peep forth." Color in itself interests him less than its changes and contrasts: Romeo "Whiter than new snow on a raven's back." Music and the human voice interest him, but the songs of birds are noted less often than one would expect. With harmony or stillness he associates the purest emotions, with discord things which he hates, such as social disorder. He seems more sensitive to foul odors (Sin smells to heaven in **Hamlet** and **Othello**) than to fragrant ones. He has marked tactile sensitivity: Falstaff holds Shallow like wax "tempering between my finger and my thumb," and Macbeth's murders stick on his hands. Images also prove "Shakespeare's delicate and discriminating palate." Images of frost nipping buds, of a river in flood, and of bear-baiting are peculiarly Shakespearean. Those of the chase show sympathy with the hunted. Bird snaring or liming "to him symbolizes the greatest pitch of terror and agony," as with Claudius at prayer. Keats-like, he projects himself into a creature as humble as the snail, which interests him as a most sensitive organism. He likes games, especially bowls. He is very conscious of the concrete details of life, and the discomforts, in a small sixteenth-century house and next to orchard and garden thinks most readily of the work-a-day kitchen. He betrays interest in carpentering, medical matters, children, especially boys, and sympathy with beggars, thieves, prisoners, and servants.

In Shakespeare's imagination, perfect love (in the biblical phrase) casteth out fear, to him "the most evil and life-draining of all emotions." Love is infinite and thus incompatible with time. Death, several times personified as a lover, is greedy, destructive, revolting. Yet it is also a relief and a sleep. Groups of images may recur. Thus in **J. C.**, **Hamlet**, **I H. IV**, **A. & C.** and **Timon** the combination dog—fawning and licking—candy or sweets—thawing or melting expresses flattery.

"The figure of Shakespeare which emerges is of a compactly well-built man, probably on the slight side, extraordinarily well co-ordinated, lithe and nimble of body, quick and accurate of eye, delighting in swift muscular movement." He was healthy and fastidious and a country man through and through. The inner man had "sensitiveness, poise, courage, humor, and wholesomeness." He can only be described as "Christ-like." He felt that we exist "to cheer and illuminate our fellow men."

Imagery as Background and Undertone

The theme of a play may raise in the dramatist's imagination a picture or symbol which constantly recurs as metaphor or simile. From **I H. VI** to **R. II** the running image is of growth and deterioration in a garden. **H. IV** lacks iterative imagery. In **H. V.** it is of the flight of birds, in **K. J.**, the sole play in which nature images are subordinate, of personifications and figures drawn from the body and its movements. The recurrent image of the bent back as a test of authorship in **H. VIII** adds new scenes to Shakespeare.

Continuous symbolism is least important in the comedies. Country images throng **M. N. D.** **Much Ado** is the only play in which images from sport head the list. Among the romances, images of trees and birds and of work and money run through **Cymbeline**, and **The Tempest** is dominated by images of sound.

Leading motives of imagery embellish and sustain the tragedies like Blakean illustrations. Through them Shakespeare colors his materials and controls their total imaginative impression. In **R. & J.** love is seen as light, of all kinds, against the background of a dark world: Juliet seems to hang brightly "upon the cheek of night/Like a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear." **Hamlet** is crowded with images of disease. In **T. & C.** these are outweighed by images of food, a subsidiary motif in **Hamlet.** Macbeth is constantly seen in terms of ill-fitting garments. Animal imagery expresses inhumanity in **Othello** and, more ferociously, in **Lear**, sharing the playwright's imagination there with all kinds of bodily agony, dislocation, and torture. Body imagery, taken over unenthusiastically from North's Plutarch, accounts for nearly one-fifth of the imagery in **Coriolanus.** The atmosphere of **A. & C.** is wholly different. The salient imagery is "of the world, the firmament, the ocean and vastness generally."

"THE SUBSTANCE OF SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY"

A. C. Bradley

(Introductory lecture in Shakespearean Tragedy (1904)

Shakespeare's tragedies (in particular **Hamlet, Othello, Lear, Macbeth**) are first of all plays of exceptional suffering and a calamity leading to the deaths of their heroes. Shakespeare's view of the tragic aspect of life includes the medieval idea of an inscrutable Fortune who smiles on a man then strikes him down from high estate; his heroes are men of rank. But a story like that of Job, even if the well-nigh unbearable afflictions of the great man led to death, would not be tragic in the Shakespearean sense. For the misfortunes of tragedy are not sent; they proceed from the deeds of men, "themselves the authors of their proper woe." These deeds are characteristic, expressive of the doer, and Shakespeare's main interest lies in character as it expresses itself dramatically in a tragic action.

Circumstances play their part also, but the dictum that for Shakespeare character is destiny exaggerates a vital truth. Other elements in the action—abnormal states of mind, supernatural agents, accident—are subordinate. The air-drawn dagger does not motivate Macbeth; he sees it because he is about to murder Duncan. Ghosts embody and confirm inward tendencies. Shakespeare admits tragic accident (Edgar arriving just too late to save Cordelia) but not so largely as to weaken our sense that catastrophe grows primarily out of character. Furthermore, tragedy "in which the hero opposes to a hostile world an undivided soul" is not of the Shakespearean kind.

The tragic heroes are exceptional spirits as well as men in high place. They live with unusual intensity. Their identification with one passion, object, or habit of mind is, for Shakespeare, the tragic trait. It evokes awe and terror as well as pity. (The difficulty at the end of **M of V** is that Shylock has reached tragic stature and we cannot believe in his acceptance of defeat.) The heroes err, but even when they are consciously wrong (Richard III, Macbeth, Antony) exhibit such greatness of soul that their falls display the possibilities of human nature. The resulting sense of waste is the center of the tragic impression. "What a piece of work is a man," tragedy asserts, so that watching its pain and self-destruction we cannot console ourselves that all is vanity.

What is the ultimate order or power in this tragic world? — religious language will not describe it. It is not simply benevolent, indifferent, or hostile. The tragic fact—piteous, fearful, mysterious—does not leave us rebellious or desperate. Blind and terribly unlucky, however, the tragic figure always achieves something quite different from his intentions. And the role of accident ("that Othello comes to be the companion of the one man in the world who is at once able enough, brave enough, and vile enough to ensnare him") contributes to a suggestion of fate, though not an arbitrary or hereditary fate.

The order is moral and its necessity, though rigorously and terribly, just. Catastrophe is the return upon the agents of their own responsible, mistaken action. There is no poetic justice (Lear for an old man's whim hardly deserves what he suffers), but the system is moral in that it "shows itself akin to good and alien from evil."

For the convulsion of suffering and death has its source in moral evil: guilty ambition and diabolic malice in **Macbeth,** adultery and murder in **Hamlet.** And evil, whether lying in the imperfections of the hero or outside him, is always "negative, barren, weakening, destructive, a principle of death." Tragedy is convulsive reaction, like that of the body to poison. We acquiesce in it because the moral order is akin to all that we admire in the characters.

Yet the order poisons itself. "The spectacle we witness scarcely warrants the assertation that the order is responsible for the good in Desdemona, but Iago for the evil in Iago." Hamlet, Antony, Macbeth do not merely sin against it. In their defects it is untrue to its own principle, and in ejecting them it loses part of its own substance, "more dangerous and unquiet, but far more valuable and nearer to its heart, than that which remains,—a Fortinbras, a Malcolm, an Octavius." Despite hints of an order transcending the tragic, "we remain confronted with the inexplicable fact, or the no less inexplicable appearance, of a world travailing for perfection, but bringing to birth, together with glorious good, an evil which it is able to overcome only be self-torture and self-waste. And this fact or appearance is tragedy."

Have You Read the Editorial Announcement?

Studies of the Elizabethan Stage from Shakespeare Survey XII

THREE SIDES VS ARENA

Taking issue with such scholars as Leslie Hotson and Alfred Harbage, Dr. George R. Kernodle of Arkansas affirms that presenting old plays "on a bare open stage, with little or no setting" is not a return to the Shakespearean method of presentation, "not the bare machine for playing imagined by twentieth-century scholars" accustomed to arena productions that spotlight "a lonely soul . . . in an empty, insubstantial universe."

Although "the stages of the Renaissance were platform stages . . . they all had very solid, three-dimensional symbols of order at the back of the open platform"—"a throne backed by a symbol of the realm," a castle, a city gate, a tomb, an altar. In contrast, "The modern arena stage is" what Dr. Kernodle calls "the poor man's Existentialism," a compromise between "the lone barren tree in **Waiting for Godot**—the one reminder of an objective world" and "the traditional realistic scenery of scientific materialism." He concludes by reminding the reader "that a unified structure can reinforce a vision of a meaningful universe," and that for the Renaissance the open stage was "used as a part of a vision of man's central place in a cosmos of dignity and order." ["The Open Stage: Elizabethan or Existentialist?" **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 1-7.]

THE IRRETRIEVABLE STAGE

"The objective facts of historical study lie as it were hidden in a dark place, where students go to search for them, each carrying his own lantern. But each of their lanterns has its own quality, brightness or dullness or particular colour, each illuminates the subject a little differently, and each will give occasion to a different version of the truth." With this introduction a professional stage designer and artist, author of **The Globe Restored,** 1953, Mr. C. Walter Hodges, reviews "the trail of legacies that we have inherited to work from in recapturing the non-existent Elizabethan playhouse," from "the antiquarian revival," through "the Timbered Cottage revival," the influence of "the Cinema, the Experimental Theatre Movement and the Flow of Action," to the "ornamental baroque reaction against former primitivism." Witness two quite different illustrations of the Fortune, "Ludwig Tieck's rendering . . . 1836" **vs.** Walter H. Godfrey's reconstruction, 1907, the baroque "suggestions . . . disregarded in England at a time when English scholars were so surrounded by the flood tide of the half-timbered vogue that they could not see beyond it." Against the varying background of mobile taste, what the original theatre was like forever escapes complete realization. ["The Lantern of Taste," **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 8-14.]

ADAPTING TO ATYPICAL STAGES

W. F. Rothwell concludes from a study "of the playhouses in which the actors performed before 1598" that "the belief . . . that there was only one type of Elizabethan theatre, with its covered, raised stage, its 'inner stage' and balcony above, and its 'music room' above that" needs modification, so also must we modify the belief that **all** of the plays were produced in the same way." Acting "before the Queen," the **summum bonum** for Elizabethan players, may have enabled them to have a relatively elaborate stage and "decor"; but on other occasions "the actors . . . must have had to adapt themselves to whatever playhouses they found themselves in." Thus in London they sometimes acted in the inns and in the guild halls (see C. T. Prouty's recent research). On the road, theatres available for an Elizabethan touring company would probably have been quite primitive. Scenic properties, too, varied in elaborateness with the kind of theatre available, as stage directions sometimes reveal. But variation is to be expected in Elizabethan England which was "after all, a country in transition . . . also an era of change and experimentation in matters dramatic and theatrical." ["Was There a 'Typical Elizabethan Stage?" **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 15-21.]

TYPICAL ELIZABETHAN STAGE

In answer to the question, "Can a 'typical' Elizabethan public playhouse be reconstructed by our present knowledge 'sufficiently authentic to permit practical study for production?'" Professor Richard Southern of the University of Bristol answers, "Yes," producing photographs of a model made by him together with sketches and plates illustrating the sources of his ideas for the reconstruction of such a theatre conforming to "the evidence at present available to us." Under three general headings, 1) "Shape and Size," 2) "Details of the Frame and Auditorium," 3) "The Interior and the Stage Background," his reconstruction favors a sixteen sided theatre which would appear roughly "round," with three galleries divided by rooms and outside staircases; a "colourful interior with early-Renaissance columns and with false marbling"; and with what he describes as a "Booth Stage," since we have . . . little positive evidence about the facade." ["On Reconstructing a Practicable Elizabethan Public Playhouse," **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 22-34.]

A NEW DISCOVERY - SPACE

In a closely argued article in which most of the examples demonstrating each point are listed with details, Professor Richard M. Hosley of the University of Missouri theorizes that Shakespeare's Globe Theatre probably possessed a "discovery-space" rather than an "inner stage," defined "as commonly reconstructed . . . as a curtain-covered [elaborately recessed space] . . . in the tiring-house wall . . . persistently used for actions localized in 'interior' scenes." In contrast, the Globe's discovery-space "need not have been deeper than 4 ft. or wider than 7 ft." and was probably "behind an open doorway in the tiring-house wall (usually . . . the middle doorway of three) essentially similar to the doorways in the Swan drawing fitted with hangings which, however "they **might** effect discoveries," were not constructed primarily therefore. ["The Discovery-space in Shakespeare's Globe," **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 35-46.]

USING THE PLAYHOUSE YARD

Instead of making "a specific search for documentary support" of the theory that "for some scenes or situations part of the yard was . . . put into histrionic service" in "the staging of Elizabethan plays," Professor Allardyce Nicoll of the University of Birmingham proceeds "step by step" beginning with "the simple inquiry whether Elizabethan actors ever had the opportunity of making their appearances otherwise than by the normally used doors." He concludes through a "scrutiny of 'passages over the stage'" found in stage directions of contemporary plays that "action at the rear portions of the yard and across the platform" were "an important part of Elizabethan stage practice." ["'Passing Over the Stage,'" **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 47-55.]

SHAKESPEARE AS A DIRECTOR

J. L. Styan imagines the point of view of Shakespeare as an Elizabethan producer working with a deep stage such as the contract for the Fortune describes, and shows subtleties of effect made possible by his placing characters at the foot of the platform, effects only possible "within the picture frame" stage by varying "the speaking of the verse." He gives six instances of occasions when Shakespeare "evidently did send the actor downstage" making him thus "seem to move . . . out of and back into the scene" with varied results. He emphasizes Shakespeare's skill in utilizing this means to add "to the flow of his drama," the "emphasis" with which "he could mark the significant statement," the "special response he could persuade from the spectator," and the "variety of tone and feeling he could create within the framework of a scene." ["The Actor at the Foot of Shakespeare's Platform," **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge Universidy Press, 1959, pp. 56-63.]

THE PLAYWRIGHT & HIS MATERIAL

Professor Rudolf Stamm, of the Universitat Bern, Switzerland, presents "a new approach to the plays [of Shakespeare]" through a study of each play's "physiognomy," **i.e.** "the **ensemble** of all those features of a text that define, explicitly or implicitly, its realization on the stage for which it was originally written." Thus the text may be studied for "the relation between speech and action," "the relationship between the dramatist's words and the stage setting," etc., and the results "consistently co-ordinated" so that "interesting affinities and differences" can "emerge" to "help us relate plays with a similar physiognomy" to the acting companies and stages for which they were written."

Moreover, "because the playwright has the play-in-performance before his mind's eye while he is transmuting source material, the comparison of a text with its sources" can also help in this kind of study. And Professor Stamm demonstrates what he means by a detailed explication of the text of **Anthony and Cleopatra** compared with its source. ["Elizabethan Stage-Practice and the Transmutation of Source Material by the Dramatists," **Shakespeare Survey 12,** ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1959, pp. 64-70.]

Have You Read the Editorial Announcement?

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE

By Hardin Craig

This text includes all the plays, sonnets, and poems of Shakespeare and offers a complete coverage of his life and times.

Illustrated, 1375 pages $8.75 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto

Fair Lawn, N. J.

Studies In Bibliography

John Russell Brown, "The Rationale of Old-Spelling Editions of the Plays of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries," SB, XIII (1960), 49-67.

John Russell Brown reviews the trend of the last fifty years towards old-spelling editions, and, by pointing out the shortcomings of two distinct kinds of old-spelling editions, supports the thesis that the photographic reproduction and the completely modernized edition "would truly fulfil the present-day needs of students and readers." The facsimile reprint (the Malone Society reprint) no longer meets the needs of the biblio-textual student because editors of this series are directed to obliterate much information. The old-spelling critical edition (Bowers' **Dekker**) "will be even less able to satisfy [the textual student]" because the editor's silent alterations destroy important evidence. Having demonstrated that neither of these editions is a final resort to the textual scholar, Brown suggests that a photographic edition with apparatus like that of the Malone Society reprints would be the solution; "the ideal for a textual student is the complete **corpus** of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama in photographic reproductions, overseen and commented upon by responsible scholars." "For those who cannot ["interpret the old-spelling"] there should be a critical edition, as fully modernized as possible."

Arthur Brown, "A Rejoinder," SB, XIII (1960), 69-76. [To J. R. Brown, Ibid., pp 49-67]

Arthur Brown counters in favor of the old-spelling edition by pointing out that the photographic reproduction cannot be trusted as a final resort and that the textual scholar must always go back to the original exemplars. He rejects the modern-spelling edition also: "I cannot understand how a responsible editor can conceive it to be part of his duty to erect more barriers than are absolutely necessary between his reader and the text." He commends the type-facsimiles and the critical editions because they both are, as they profess to be, the careful work of editors who have conscientiously studied the originals.

Harold Jenkins, "Playhouse Interpolations in the Folio Text of Hamlet," SB, XIII (1960), 31-47.

Professor Jenkins raises a question about some 65 words or brief phrases in **Hamlet** that are present in F and lacking in Q2. The words are generally considered as omissions from Q, but they may more readily be explained as additions to F. Accepting the thesis that the quarto represents Shakespeare's foul papers, Prof. Jenkins suggests that the words are actors' intrusions and that they should be deleted by editors. Some of them are F verbalizations of off-stage speeches or noises; "when extra dialogue in F embellishes the stage-business, . . . it does so in a crude and obvious way." Other additions cheapen the action. Still others "do no more than reduplicate what is already present in Q." In discussing such repetitions, Prof. Jenkins has much to say of critics who see in them a trick of Hamlet's personality. Similar interpolations appear in reported texts; **Hamlet** Q1 and **Richard III** Q1 serve as comparable examples. They confirm "that many of the little words and phrases which **[Hamlet]** F has in excess of Q are in fact actors' additions."

W. Craig Ferguson, "The Compositors of Henry IV, Part 2, Much Ado About Nothing, The Shoemakers' Holiday, and The First Part of the Contention," SB, XIII (1960), 19-29.

Mr. Ferguson examines four dramatic quartos printed by Valentine Simmes in 1600 in order to ascertain the compositor (s) involved. One compositor, active in the four plays, rarely followed his unabbreviated speech-headings with periods. On the basis of this characteristic,—with some corroboration from stage directions, catchwords, signatures, spelling, and distinguishing types — Ferguson assigns to this compositor (Compositor A) all of **2 Henry IV**, all of **Much Ado**, and most of **The First Part of the Contention.** To another compositor (B) he assigns sheet A and the outer forme of B in the **Contention.** Two compositors set **The Shoemakers' Holiday**, A and possibly B; the former's stint included about 31 pages.

A Tempestuous Tempest

Despite the intense efforts of an ambitious director a production of **The Tempest** at the East Seventy-Fourth Street Theatre in New York City came to naught. Rolf Forsberg, Director and producer, frequently had his actors rehearse in the dark to make them acutely aware of their places and had them sing their lines on some occasions to secure "an accurate blending of voices." Calisthenics and interpretive movements were required to secure poise and practice sessions of recitation in pure paraphrase were attempted to secure perfect understanding.

But the December production did not please the **New York Times** critic. The island (which the critic persisted in calling Bermuda) was "shell-like" and interesting (designed by Andre Johns and Robert Darnell) and Thomas O'Horgan's music "dainty" and "appropriate." But the production was called "incompetent." Lines were drowned out by the opening storm and the frantic turning of the wheel would have sunk the ship if the storm had not. Prospero spoke verse with the "rhythm of train announcer." Miranda was "insipid," Ariel "like a senior in a finishing school." The play is difficult to produce, but this version was too "witless and heavy," and seemed to have been written by "a chartered accountant."

The Newsletter has openings for Contributing Editors, especially in institutions with numerous current periodicals.

. . . The intellectual measure of every man since born, in the domains of creative thought, may be assigned to him, according to the degree in which he has been taught by Shakespeare.

John Ruskin

Just published:

Leslie Hotson's

SHAKESPEARE'S WOODEN O

Presents his unique theory that the Elizabethan stage was constructed in the round.

Illustrated **$6.50**

The Macmillan Company
60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

Dissertation Digest

The Double Plot in Elizabethan Drama, Norman Rabkin, Harvard University, 1959, 303 pages.

Readers have long been aware that a peculiarity of Elizabethan drama is the frequency of subplots, often with no apparent relation to the main plot. Dr. Rabkin investigates the beginnings and development of the subplot in early Elizabethan drama, and observes its use by three dramatists of the mature period. Rather than making an exhaustive study of the functions of the subplot, he emphasizes the question of whether a given subplot is related by theme to the main plot, so that the play may be said to be "unified." The plays selected for examination all have two or more discrete plots, in which the causal relationship found between actions in "complex" plays does not exist. A typical double plot play is Heywood's **A Woman Killed with Kindness**; a characteristic "complex" play is his **A Maidenhead Well Lost**, in which the separate amours interact casually at several points.

Dr. Rabkin suggests the origins of the double plot in classical drama and in the characteristically mediveal notion, aesthetic as well as cosmological, of diversified unity. He explores the simultaneous development of the double plot technique in a number of kinds of Tudor plays. In neo-Senecan tragedy (e.g., **Gismond of Salerne**) a narrator frequently recounts tales explicitly parallel to the action of the play. Certain plays which combine morality techniques with historical or mythological material (e.g., **Cambyses**) employ parodistic comic subplots. In other plays (e.g., **The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune**) a dramatic frame embodies the theme of the main action. Most revealing is the growth of the dumb show, which invariably reinforces the explicit moral of the play, from the Italian **intermedio**, which seldom had more connection to the play in which it appeared than the Elizabethan jig at a tragedy. Thus in **Gorboduc** miniscule allegorical dramas mutely illustrate the point of the action immediately ensuing. In virtually all of the early plays, the dramatists add extraneous material to the matter they adapt, taking pains to establish and make obvious the thematic relationship between parts.

Edwardes, Whetstone, Lyly, Peele, Greene, and others refine the subtlety of the form, making possible the presentation of increasingly rich themes. By the time of Heywood, Dekker, and Middleton, the organization of disparate materials about a central theme is a dominant convention of much Elizabethan drama. Dr. Rabkin suggests that, unlike most of his contemporaries, Shakespeare tends to eschew the completely autonomous subplot in favor of causally interrelated actions, but that, in a different manner, the plays reflect the traditional principle of thematic unity in diversity.

"Shakespeare's Wooden O"

Shakespeare's Wooden O, Dr. Leslie Hotson's latest book on the Elizabethan stage has received a warm reception on its publication in England. **The News Chronicle** featured it as The Book of the Week and queried "Is this the end of the great stage mystery?" J. C. Trewin of the **Birmingham Post** confessed himself "more than three parts persuaded already." J. B. Priestly in the widely circulated **Reynolds News** reports that he is completely converted and was making every effort to insert his new belief in his forthcoming **Time and Western Man. The Western Mail** of Cardiff believes the book "could revolutionise the history of the English Stage," and **The Scotsman** of Edinburgh gives it much space and heads its review Elizabethan Stage Rediscovered. **Shakespeare's Wooden O** has just been published in the U.S. by Macmillan.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Laurel Shakespeare, Francis Fergusson, General Editor. Twelfth Night commentary by E. Martin Browne; The Merchant of Venice, Morris Carnovsky; Julius Caesar, Philip Lawrence. New York, Dell, 1958-9, 35c each.

These paper backed Shakespeares are printed in large type, have lines numbered in fives, contain no footnotes, have glossaries at the end of the volumes, and follow the Charles Jasper Sisson text. An essay on Shakespeare and his Theatre and a bibliography is repeated at the end of each of the volumes. The editor also contributes a critical introduction to each play, a brief bibliography, and a note on the text. The commentaries are by directors and actors and are most interesting because they present points of view not usually found in editions of Shakespeare's plays. Of the latter, some brief comments follow. Browne finds all Shakespeare's middle comedies based on the theme of blindness, "people who are for some reason cutting themselves off from reality, refusing or neglecting to see it until the circumstances of the plot or the attentions of their fellows force them to do so." In **As You Like It** Duke Senior is blind in thinking rustic life better, characters in **Much Ado** are blind when they think they can avoid the opposite sex. Olivia is blind to think that she can mourn for seven years. Blindness and obsession and absurdity are somehow related. Browne, a director, notes that Olivia is usually cast older than Viola, but agrees that she should be younger, or else Sebastian would be marrying an older than himself, which, Orsino said, (perhaps echoing Shakespeare's experience) was the proper procedure.

Morris Carnovsky, one of the stars of the American Shakespeare Festival in Connecticut, contributes an excellent essay to **The Merchant of Venice.** Carnovsky agrees with Hazlitt that the philosophical part of the audience "are disposed to think that Jewish revenge is at least as good as Christian injuries." Only the Gratianos in the audience would be happy to see Shylock "ground down and out." Shakespeare created well: "He may even have set out to curse, but he remained to pray: he could not do otherwise, for he was Shakespeare." What Shylock does "may be reprehensible, but it is tragically and recognizably human." He decides "to stand and fight no matter the cost."

Philip Lawrence, director of the Shakespeare-wrights **Julius Caesar,** notes that the play has no hero: enemies speak well of each other, assassins kill for patriotism. Caesar needs the show of authority and it leads to his death. Brutus is a hero without an antagonist; he does not hate the man he kills. Cassius is no villain, or else Brutus is a fool for following; the conspiracy falls because Brutus over-rules his suggestions that Antony die with Caesar, that Antony not be permitted to speak at Caesar's funeral, that they do not fight Caesar at Philippi. Antony is not ambitious; he acts only for love of Caesar. Lawrence's further comments on how he cut the play from 38 characters to 16, and omitted and condensed scenes for economy and clarity are interesting in view of the fact that his production had the second longest run in U.S. dramatic history. Would the full play have failed otherwise? Is Lawrence greater than Shakespeare?

The Dream on TV

With America eagerly looked forward to the Memorial Theatre production of the **MND** on a Ford spectacular, it is interesting to note that the Colorado Shakespeare Festival production of this play was also televised two nights after the Festival closed last summer. Four cameras were used. A fifth was aimed at Howard M. Banks of El Camino College who did the commentary.

Valency, Maurice, In Praise of Love: An Introduction to the Love-Poetry of the Renaissance, New York, Macmillan, 1958, $6.00.

Having been both a student under Professor Jefferson Butler Fletcher and Professor Valency, I know well the love of the Renaissance that the former evoked in the latter. The present book is a fitting monument. Although the book begins with the "invention" of the "system of love-poetry" in the 11th and 12th centuries and ends with Dante, its frame of reference extends beyond those limits. By the time of Dante, all that could be said about love had been said, except perhaps about the "love of the disembodied spirit." Love, ladies, and gallantry had become stereotyped. Literature could seek only new conceits. Shakespeare's satire on the tradition in Sonnet 130, "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun," does not end love poetry, but to go beyond, one continued at his own risk. The jealous husband had become a comic figure or a diabolical villain. Professor Valency tells us of the man who served his wife her lover's heart. It is to Shakespeare's credit that Othello is diabolical but achieves dignity. Love was an occupational disease of the leisured class and the Renaissance well could describe its symptoms. Polonius follows in the traditional physiology when he describes Hamlet having fallen first into sadness, then into a fast, then to sleeplessness, weakness, lightness, and madness. As a source book for love or a text book for gallantry, the book is valuable.

White, John S., Renaissance Cavalier, New York, Philosophical Library, 1959, pp. 66. $3.50

This is an interesting analysis of Castiglione's **Courtier** depicting the Renaissance gentleman as a universal type as compared with Machiavelli's Prince who is rather a "national phenomenon." The man of the court, is a man of "honor." He must be of good birth, choose good friends, be educated in arms, intellect, and have courage. Language and the arts must be cultivated. He must have wit, and the proper attitude toward women. Love must be spiritual; he must dominate women mentally, not physically. In the fourth book of **The Courtier** Mr. White sees a change in Castiglione's motivation. The first three books aimed at the exhibition of a Renaissance Man; the fourth book, composed most likely when Castiglione was older, concerns itself with the purpose of the Courtier which is the education of a Prince. From aesthetic individualism, a gentleman for gentleman's sake, the book becomes ethical. The greatest influence of Castiglione therefore comes from the first three books. Perhaps the ills of world today are due to a cultural attitude "which by its detachment from the vital and fundamental problems of life saps the roots of its own existence." Do we need more of Machiavelli and less of Castiglione?

Maverick and Shakespeare

Devotees of TV's Maverick, one of the more popular heroes of adult westerns, may have been surprised when on January 17 the **Romeo and Juliet** theme was reshuffled into a pair of feuding families named Montgomery and Cartaret. With the similarity of the names and the feuding of the families, all correspondence ends. With Maverick as the counterpart of the Friar, it was expected that all would end happily, and it did.

Have you read the Editorial Announcement?

The Pelican Shakespeare: Alfred Harbage, General Editor. Penguin Book, Baltimore, Maryland. 50c and 65c each. Othello, G. E. Bentley; Twelfth Night, C. T. Prouty; Much Ado, J. W. Bennett; Troilus and Cressida, Virgil K. Whitaker; King Lear, Alfred Harbage; The Tempest, Northrop Frye; The Tempest, Ralph M. Sargent; The Merchant of Venice, Brents Stirling.

Twenty-one volumes have been thus far edited in this handy series. Text is legible, footnotes not excessive but handy, lines numbered in fives, text based on good principles (Harbage's **King Lear** prints variants from the Pied Bull Quarto in brackets and indicates other variants in an Appendix), and the individual ten or more page introductions informative and thought provoking. Brevity permits for only a few representative illustrations. Othello is a tragedy "of another deluded mortal who destroys what he loves best." In 12th Night we see the conventional love of Orsino, the foolish love of Sir Andrew, the love of wit which makes Sir Toby marry Maria, and the presumptuous love of Malvolio. Miss Bennett shows that Claudio's behaviour is proper Elizabethan and he is not to be censured. **T & C** is not Shakespeare's greatest play, but in some "respects his most modern." In **The Tempest** "there is also an emphasis on moral and spiritual rebirth which suggests rituals of initiation, like baptism or the ancient mystery dramas, as well as of festivity." Alfred Harbage declares that "Lear's anguish now represents for us Man's horror and sense of helplessness at the discovery of evil - the infiltration of animality in the human world, naked cruelty and appetite. It is a fissure that threatens to widen infinitely, and we see Lear at the center of turbulence as it works its breakage in minds, in families, in nations, in the heavens themselves, interacting in dreadful concatenation . . . . He batters himself to pieces against the fact of evil." In **As You Like It** Ralph Sargent finds Rosalind "alert to the world around her, to its snares and opportunities . . . . It has often been suggested that women are the great civilizing force. Shakespeare in his portrait of Rosalind has come close to showing us why." **The Merchant of Venice** concerns more than Shylock and the Bond. To consider Bassanio a materialist and an opportunist is "to confuse dramatic characters with real people." It is difficult to choose between a tragic Shylock and a comic. We are warned against transferring our own confusion to Shakespeare. Shakespeare's "major ethical theme is Christian mercy versus pagan retaliation." But yet when the Elizabethan audience was "warmed" to Shylock by the "Hath not a Jew eyes" speech, there would have been "a strange pause in the laughter." Shylock enters "the trap that awaits anyone, Jew or Christian, who reduces himself to the ethical level of his persecutors by meeting evil with evil."

It would be nice if at the end of the series Professor Harbage would gather all the introductory essays into one volume. The collection would sell widely to those who feel that they already have enough editions of Shakespeare on their shelves.

Canadian Seminar

A Shakespeare Seminar is being planned by the leading Canadian universities to be held in conjunction with the Canadian Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Canada. Professor Charles Jasper Sisson of the Shakespeare Institute at Stratford-upon-Avon is scheduled to give two lectures. The seminar will be held from July 17 to July 22 and is directed toward teachers, students, and other interested Shakespeareans.

The Purging of Cleopatra

Donald C. Baker, Univ. of Mississippi

From many points of view, one of the most interesting scenes in **Antony and Cleopatra** is the famous dialogue between Cleopatra and the clown who brings to her the asp covered in a basket of fig leaves (V. ii). On the surface, the clown's banter is incongruous, juxtaposed as it is to the final speeches of Cleopatra and the climactic act of suicide. For the rustic clown, armed with crude but smile-provoking puns, insists upon loading his references to the snake with obvious **double-entendres.** This scene has long been explained by commentators as another example of that earthy humor with which Shakespeare daubs his tragedies, presumably for the entertainment of that many-headed and little understood animal, the Elizabethan audience. Ever since De Quincey knocked at the gates of **Macbeth,** however, critics and scholars have been moving toward a more meaningful interpretation of such scenes. I would suggest that the clown with his crude wit serves, in a remarkably effective manner, a dramatic and poetic purpose which is important to Shakespeare's concept of Cleopatra.

This concept of Cleopatra is embedded in the play's language, a language which is far and away the most sensuous, sensual in Shakespeare's work. It is a language so sexual in its metaphors (the basic language of the play, not the "quibbles") that even Bowdler was constrained to make few changes because it would have meant rewriting the play. Cleopatra is clearly, whatever else she is, the essence of the earth. She seldom speaks without revealing her nature; indeed, she revels in it: "O happy horse, to bear the weight of Antony!" "Ram thou thy fruitful tidings in mine ears,/That long time have been barren." And perhaps the most startling shift of emphasis in the play occurs in her death scene, when she is, in her own words, etheralized; she leaves her body, and with the anticipation of leaving, her language abruptly changes:

> Give me my robe, put on my crown; I have
> Immortal longings in me. Now no more
> The juice of Egypt's grape shall moist this lip.
> Yare, yare, good Iras: quick. Methinks I hear
> Antony call. I see him rouse himself
> To praise my noble act. I hear him mock
> The luck of Caesar, which the gods give men
> To excuse their after wrath. Husband, I come!
> Now to that name my courage prove my title!
> I am fire and air; my other elements
> I give to baser life. (ll. 282-293)

The sensuality of her language is gone. The pathetic reference to Death as a "lover's pinch,/Which hurts, and is desired . . . " is all that remains.

But this is not totally unexpected. It is, indeed, what one might well have expected, even from Cleopatra. My point is simply a structural one. It is that the clown's speeches immediately preceding this one of Cleopatra serve a transitional purpose not only for the action which follows but for the tone of the language itself. It is simply that the clown anticipates the pun on "die" inherent in the death of so sensual a creature. As is so often the case, Shakespeare anticipates and turns to his own use the ironic and humorous implications of a scene which otherwise might thwart his purpose (as, for example, Hamlet's greeting the ghostly "Swear" from beneath the stage with "Art thou there, truepenny?" Robert Penn Warren has referred to this habit of Shakespeare's as his making his "peace" with Mercutio.) Therefore, all the business about the pretty worm of Nilus, the "joy of the worm," is taken care of by one, as it were, licensed to do it, the clown. The clown in effect purges the baser elements of the language of the play as Cleopatra purges herself and leaves her other elements "to baser life." The way is clear for Cleopatra's speech of immortal longings, the transition to fire and air.

[Professor Baker earned his Ph. D. at the University of Oklahoma in 1954. Published in PMLA, Studies in the Renaissance, etc.]

Shakespeare's Source For The Name "Laertes"

William M. Jones, University of Missouri

When Shakespeare began writing **Hamlet,** he had a mass of source material behind him that has occupied the studies of Shakespeareans for a long time. Saxo Grammaticus, Belleforest's **Histories Tragiques,** a lost play, Seneca, and all the revenge tragedies of the age lie behind the play. Yet one source has so far been passed over. The name "Laertes" leads to that source.

Although Shakespeare could have, in theory, used any names he pleased for the characters in the play, he actually used most of the names supplied him in the sources. For Ophelia, Polonius, and Laertes, however, names are not found in the recognized sources. Further, within the known lists of personal names in the sixteenth century, the name "Laertes" does not appear. William Camden, writing in the next century, states the sixteenth century's attitude toward names: " . . . names among all Nations and tongues (as I partly noted before) are significative, and not vain senseless sounds." (**Remaines,** London, 1657, pp. 52-53). After this initial comment on personal names, he gives a rather thorough list. But "Laertes" does not appear here, in any other list, or in any of the literature of the century, as far as I can discover.

The Obvious Source

The obvious source for the name is the Greek literature which every sixteenth century English school boy was obliged to study. According to T. W. Baldwin in **William Shakespeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke** (Urbana, 1944), II, 419, Shakespeare had probably memorized portions of Ovid's **Heroides** (I 97) and **Metamorphoses** (XIII, 48) before he reached the fifth form. In both these works Laertes is spoken of as the father of Ulysses. And it is thus that Laertes is spoken of too in **Titus Andronicus,** I. i. 381.

Ovid only mentions Laertes, but in the Odyssey **Laertes** plays a significant part in the action by helping Ulysses gain revenge on Penelope's suitors. Although Baldwin finds little evidence that Shakespeare had any first-hand knowledge of the **Odyssey,** Shakespeare may well have read a Latin translation.

The natural question now, of course, is why, of all the names at Shakespeare's disposal, should he have chosen the rather odd name of Ulysses' father for the character who is the son of Polonius, a man of Poland. The first point to notice in investigating the name is that in **Hamlet** Shakespeare's major area of expansion of his sources is within the Polonius family. In the Belleforest source the girl used to tempt the prince into revealing his sanity has no connection with the man killed behind the arras. And, since the prince in Belleforest was slain by another uncle, Wiglerus, there was no need for a character to perform Laertes' function.

In **Hamlet,** however, the Polonius family offers a careful balance to Hamlet's own problems. In the first scene of the first act, Laertes' petition to the king is handled and granted before the king turns to his own foster son, who is "too much i' th' sun." In the first speech that mentions Laertes by name the king makes use of the name repeatedly and concludes with a reference to the father-son relationship (I. i. 42-49). Although not steeped in Greek learning, Shakespeare has called up a Greek name for this character. The relationship that suggested this name was probably that of fathers and sons, a relationship which he investigates thoroughly in **Hamlet.**

This idea of the father-son relationship is supported by Belleforest's treatment of the story. In his introduction he comments at length on various father-son conflicts, David and Absolom, Bajazeth and Sultan Zelim, Soliman and Mustapha. These references to fathers and sons might well call up the famous Ulysses, who is frequently referred to as **"Uios Laeteo,"** son of Laertes.

Reasons More Relative

A careful check of **Hamlet** and the **Odyssey** reveals even more valid reasons for the use of the name "Laertes." At the beginning of **Hamlet** the prince sits brooding over the wedding feast. At the beginning of the **Odyssey** Telemachus sits brooding among the wooers of his mother. To each of these sons comes news of a supernatural sort, Horatio's news of the old Hamlet's ghost, Athena's visit from Olympus in the form of Mentor. Both supernatural agents demand that the sons take action to restore their fathers to their rightful positions, one to the throne of Ithaca, the other to eternal rest. These sons' responses to the supernatural demands are in both works the cause of the remaining action. It is not surprising that Shakespeare, probably trained in the analogous thinking of the Renaissance, should have turned to the Odyssey for a name.

It seems, however, that the natural name for the son would have been Telemachus. But his mind probably rejected that name because it would have been too obviously related to the **Odyssey.** Shakespeare did not necessarily want to raise in the minds of his audience a conscious comparison of the two works. All he wanted was a suitable name for a character. He himself may have been only half-conscious of the thought process that brought him to this particular name for the son. Nevertheless, the relationship is there.

The relationship, as a matter of fact, seems even to carry over into another name choice. Laertes' sister also needed a name. Once the first Greek name had been chosen, the natural choice for hers was also a Greek one, "Ophelia," meaning "help" or "succor." This name had been coined by Sannazaro for his **Arcadia** in 1504. Whether Shakespeare was aware of the irony involved in giving the helpless, docile Ophelia such a name, I do not know.

Nor am I certain how much more the similarity with the **Odyssey** influenced Shakespeare once he had seen the father-son relationships. Many thematic echoes may be due simply to the basic similarity in the two stories. The first story referred to within the story of Telemachus' desire to leave the wooers and find news of his father is one that tells of Aegisthus, who marries another man's wife, kills the real husband, and is slain in turn by the revenging son, Orestes. Zeus meditates on this story as he makes the opening speech of the **Odyssey.** Such vague relationships are probably insignificant except that in bulk they suggest how far the choosing of one character's name may lead an author, or a critic.

Cleopatra's Creator

Betty Bandel, University of Vermont

"Royal Egypt, Empress," Iras cries to Cleopatra as Egypt's queen approaches death. Cleopatra answers:

No more but e'en a woman, and commanded
By such poor passion as the maid that milks
And does the meanest chares.

Professor Ralph Behrens in the November, 1959, issue of **The Shakespeare Newsletter** nods approvingly and says in effect that all the "apparent lapses" in Cleopatra's love for Antony are "simply feminine wiles," and that her questionable conduct in other matters is caused by "feminine fear," or neglect, or "the instinct of self-preservation," forsooth.

There is no doubt about it. Cleopatra was good. She was good enough to take in Antony. She is good enough to take in Professor Behrens. She has, presumably, been good enough to take in legions of other men and even women who have dreamed the Victorian dream that there is a double standard of honor, and that all is forgiven the Little Woman provided she loves.

That Cleopatra was not good enough to take in her creator, who made her far less queenly than even Plutarch's Cleopatra, is indicated, I think by scores of other Shakespearean women—women who know as surely as the best Shakespearean men do that the world is not well lost for love; and women who, forgetting this truism, bring the world down about their ears. There is Beatrice, whose friend's honor is as important to her as is her own love. There are queens like Hermione, great ladies like Paulina or the old Duchess of York, whose courage and honesty equal their love. There is, for Heaven's sake, even Lady Macbeth, so loving a lady that Scotland swims in blood at least partly because of her devotion.

Thou hast conquered, O great Stratfordian
The world swoons at thy touch.

TO THE MANY SUBSCRIBERS WHO SENT RENEWAL CHECKS IN RESPONSE TO OUR LONG DELAYED REMINDER, MANY, MANY THANKS. TO THOSE WHO HAVE NOT AS YET REPLIED, A CHECK FOR THE AMOUNT MENTIONED ON THE CARD WILL STILL CARRY YOU TO THE INDICATED DATE OF EXPIRATION.

→ R. S. V. P. ←

S N L INDEX FOR 1959

Acting, changing styles, 16; directing Othello, 9; Garrick's interpretations, 13; gestures, 39; in Armenia, 14; in colleges, 15; producing S., 2; production of T. N., 25; records vs. stage play, 16; stage-craft in W. T., 15; staging Mac., 27, 30
Adams, Robert P., Authorship, 20, 39; on K.L., 26
Akrigg, G. P. V., sources, 14
Alexander, Edward, S. in India, 14
ALL'S WELL, Guthrie's, 33; debased, 34; style, 38
Altick, Richard D., S. reprints, 23.
ANTONY & CLEOPATRA, Actium, 16; Antony, 16, 23; Christian value, 19; Claudius, 16; Cleopatra, 16, 37; love play, 11, 12, 13; death of Cleopatra, 24; Octavia, 14; at Oregon, 25; paradoxical metaphor, 14; Seneca's infl., 40;
Arthos, John, fall of Othello, 28.
AS YOU LIKE IT, 13; in Canada, 33; in college, 15; recording of, 16
Atkinson, B., on festival, 33; J. C., 25
BALDWIN, T. W., Andria formula, 30
Barish, T. S. & M. Waingrow, service to society in Lear, 14.
Barker, Richard H., on Middleton, 20
Barton, T. P., plays of S., 32
Baughan, D. E., Hamlet's lunacy, 30
Beckerman, Dr. Bernard, 1
Behrens, R., Cleopatra, 37
Bentley, Gerald E., Stuart history, 10
Bernheimer, Richard, Elizabethan theatre, 3
Bethel, S. L. Othello, 3
Bibliography, Fredson Bowers, ed., Studies in Biblio., 23; Cambridge Biblio.; 20; compositor spellings, 40; Greg on bad Quarto, 12; RIII text, 40; Stuart, 10; Walker, A., Textual Problems of the First Folio, 12
Bluestone, Max, Prose Fiction in Elizn. theatre, 34
BOOKS, R. H. Barker, Thomas Middleton, 20; L. D. Benezet, Loves of S., 12; W. Bridges-Adams, The Irresistible Theatre, 12; J. R. Brown, S. and his Comedies, 4; G. Bullough, Narrative & Dramatic Sources of S., 39; L. B. Campbell, S's Histories, 20; R. C. Churchill, S. and his Betters, 39; G. B. Evans, Supplement to IHIV, 19; R. A. Foakes, H. VIII, 12; L. Fox, S's Town & Country, 31; D. M. Frame, The Complete Works of Montaigne, 6; C. S. French, King Lear: Poem or Play, 18; W. W. Greg, Some Aspects & Problems of London Publishing between 1550 and 1650, 12; F. E. Halliday, S. in his age, 4; G. B. Harrison, A Second Jacobean Journal, 20, 39; A. G. Hirzl, Economy of Action & Word in S. plays, 39; C. B. Hogan, S. in the Theatre—1701-1800, 4; J. Houseman & J. Landau, Amer. S. Fest., 35; G. W. Knight, The Sovereign Flower, 38; H. Kokeritz, S's Names, 35; D. E. Mason, Music in Eliz. Eng., 18; McManaway & others, J. Q. Adams Memorial Studies, 31; A. F. Potts, S. and the Faerie Queen, 20, 39; A. Ralli, Hist. of S. Crit., 35; M. R. Ridley, S's Plays, 12; Shakespeare Quarterly, 3, 11, 14, 31, 38; Shakespeare Survey ed. by A. Nicoll, 15; P. N. Siegel, S. Tragedy & the Eliz. Compromise, 4; R. Southern, Medieval Theatre in the Round, 1; B. Stirling, Unity in S., 4; D. Traversi, S. from RII to HV, 22; T. W. Wadsworth, The Poacher from Stratford, 20, 39; A. Walker, Problems of 1st Folio, 12; Alice Walker and J. D. Wilson, Othello, 12; Geo. Watson, Cambridge Biblio., 20; B. White, Year's Work in Eng. Studies, 20; J. Winney, ed., The Frame of Order, 12;
Bowmer, Angus, production of T.N., 25
Bradbrook, M.C., S. and Chaucer's Troilus, 3
British Theatre Museum Assoc., 1;
Brockbank, Dr. J.P., Hist. in Cym., 22; M.N.D., 36;
Brooks Charles, Staging Mac., 40
Brooks, Dr. H., M.N.D., 36;
Brown, John R., song in M of V, 32; S & his Comedies, 4
Bullough, Geoffrey, S's sources, 39
Burnim, K. A., Garrick as director, 13; Garrick's letters, 28
CAIRNCROSS, A. S., on RII, 40
Campbell, D., as actor, 17, 33
Campbell, Mildred, Social history, 10
Carlisle, C. J., Macbeth actors, 30
Churchill, R. C., S & his Betters, 39
Chwalewik, Prof. W., "dream" in MND, 36
Ciolli, A., index to S. characters, 23
Clemen, W., comments on RIII, 31
COMEDY OF ERRORS, Catholic players, 34; early comedy, 36; overdone, 34
CORIOLANUS, authority in, 11; politics, 11.
Craig, Hardin, Ellis-Fermor Fund, 33; K.L. at Globe, 30; textual degeneration, 22
Creeth, Edmund, landmarks of criticism, 28, 39
Criticism, Bradley attacked, 5, 16; Coleridge, 35; Imagery, 3; language, 5; obscurantists, 2; sins of, 3; Stoll's Anachronism in S. crit., 28
Crow, John, Sins of crit., 3
Cunningham, D. G., return to laughter, 29
Cutts, J. P., music in Temp., 4
CYMBELINE, a failure?, 16; cycle and crisis, 22; histrionics and history, 22; Imogen 13, 15, 16, 18; Jachimo, 16; magic, 22; music, 22; Posthumus, 16
DOBSON, E. J. Words in Temp., 32
Doss, S. H., Unity of Play & Song, 4
Drury Lane, account book, 13; under Garrick, 13
Dunlap, J. F., Akron Festival, 25
EAGLE, R. L., S. women, 8
Elizabethan Age, beliefs, 12; imagination, 8; language, 5, 14; women, 8
Ellis-Fermor, Una, fund, 33
Emery, John P., on HV, 37
Emslie, MacDonald, H. VIII, 32
Evans, G. Blakemore, IHIV Supl. 20
FARNHAM, W., Weisinger vs. Wilson, 19
FESTIVALS, Am. S., 1; Colorado, 9, 33; Earle Grey, 25; Hofstra, 1; New York City, 17, 25, 26; Oregon, 1, 9, 25; Stan Hywet, 9, 25; Stratford, Can., 9, 33; Stratford, Conn., 9, 17, 25, 36; Stratford, Eng., 1, 2, 9, 17, 33; School program, 1.
Flint, M. K., on Temp., 32
Fludd's Theatre, 3
Foakes, R. A., 1st Folio of H. VIII, 23
Fogel, E. G., on "greenfields", 38
Folger Library, Conference on Stuart & Tudor history, 10, 13; new amenities, 1; values of research library, 2
Folio, 4; H. VIII, 23; problems, 12; recording, 15, 32;
Fox, Levi, S.'s town & country, 31
Frame, Donald M. edits Montaigne, 6
Freedley, George, S. theatre collection 24
French, Carolyn S., on K.L., 18
GARDNER, Edmund, on MND, 32
Garrick, David, as director, 13; letters of, 28
Gascon, Jean, directs Othello, 17
Gates, W. B., S. & H. Irving, 40
Gielgud, John, as Benedick, 17
Goldstein, Leonard, acting styles, 16
Greg, W. W., Edits True Tragedy Facs., 12
Grey, Earle, loses theatre, 25
Guthrie, Tyrone, All's Well, 33; AYLI, 33
HALL, Peter, Directs MND, 33
HAMLET, and Antonio's Revenge, 38; authority in, 11, 13; Chekov's use of, 14; Claudius, 14; Claudius & dumb show, 8; dualism, 37; German & Hungarian trans., 31; gravediggers songs, 5; Lear parallels, 26; lunacy, 30; Old Vic on T.V., 2; on T.V., 17; Ophelia, 40, 14; Ophelia's madness, 3; Ophelia's songs, 5; Polonius, 8; procrastinator, 28; Quin in, 6; Seneca's influence, 40; turning point of S.'s language, 5; Ur-Hamlet, 38; world view, 4
Haraszti, Zoltan, perfect folio, 32
Harbage, A., Revision of Annals, 1
Hardacre, P. H., Stuart history, 10
Hardy, Barbara, on Coleridge, 35
Harris, Bernard, on Othello, 22
Harrison, G. B., Elizn. Journal, 20; 39
Hart, J. A., Anger of Prospero, 23
Haywood, Chas., S. Music course, 17
HENRY IV, Falstaff, 5, 6, 13;

Falstaff's death, 38; Pistol's character, 32
HENRY V, exonerated, 37; politics, 11, 14;
HENRY VI, parts I, II, III, politics, 11, True Tragedy ed., 12
HENRY VIII, compared with Cym., 31; crisis, 22; dispute over authorship, 12; printer's copy, 23
Herbert, Carolyn, Comedy in Othello, 24
Hewes, Henry, on Macbeth, 25
Highfill, Phillip Jr., on Quin as actor, 6
Hill, R. F., tragic mode of S., 31
Hoepfner, T. C., on Malvolio, 8
Holland, N. W., Claudius & dumb show, 8
Houseman, John, directing festival, 17; hist. of Amer. S. Fest., 35; quits as director, 25
Hubler, Edw., Christian approach to S., 13
Hulme, Hilda, dialect of S., 40; language of S., 14
Hunter, Dr. G. K., on S., & Lyly, 36
INSTITUTE of Renaissance Studies, 9
International S., Institute, 36
Irvine, Theodora, dictionary, 35
Irving, Sir Henry, Archives, 1
JENKIN, Bernard, A & C, 23
Jenkins, H., Pistol's char., 32
Jenkins, Raymond, tragic hero, 30
Jordan, W. K., Tudor history, 10
Josten, Walter, trans. of Mac., 39
JULIUS CAESAR, at N.Y.C., 25; in India, 14; politics, 11; Quin in, 6
KAUFMAN, E. K., on Hamlet, 38
Keeler, Mary, Stuart bibliography, 10
Kermode, Frank, on his Temp. ed., 32
KING JOHN, at Oregon, 25
KING LEAR, as poem, 18; authority, 11, 13; characters, 14; Christian value, 19, 23; Edgar, 14; ending of, 31; at Globe, 30; Kent, 14; love, 32; parallel with Hamlet, 26; revenge, 26; service to society, 14; sex and pessimism, 5; staging, 28; swearing, 8; use of living sources, 14; world view, 4.
Kokeritz, Helge, on S.'s Names, 35
Kreutz, Irving, Staging Macbeth, 27
Knight, G. W., S. poet of royalism, 38
Knoepfle, John, on Macbeth, 26
Landau, Jack, appointed director, 25; hist. of Amer. S. Fest., 35
Langham, Michael, as director, 17
Laughton, Charles, as Bottom, 33
Law, Robert, authorship of H. VIII, 12
Lawrence, John, on S. relics, 18
Lawrence, W. W., on M for M, 38
Lea, Kathleen, on T. of S., 36
Leech, Clifford, on last plays, 22
Leighton, Margaret, as Beatrice, 17
Levin, Harry, on R & J, 11
Levitsky, R. M., S. on patience, 29;
Lievsay, John, England and Italy, 10
Lithgow, Arthur, at Akron, 25
LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST, Armado, 5; Costard, 5, 13, 15; Holofernes, 5, 8; language, 5; influence of Lyly, 36; rhythm, 36;
Lyly, John, Infl. on S., 36
Lyons, C. P., imagery, 30; narrative in S., 30
MACBETH, actor's roles, 30; use of aspiration, 4; at Boston, 17, 25; Christian conscience, 19; despair in, 7; Garrick's, 13; Magic, 22; optimism, 3; politics, 11; Quin, 6; and RIII, 19; Seneca's infl. 40; modern staging, 27; world view, 4
Mack, Maynard, filmed Hamlet, 17
Marder, Louis, corruption of S plays, 34; Epistolary S. Club, 26; on S birthplace, 18; staging Hamlet & T.N., 2;
Mark, T. R., Hungarian trans. of S, 31
Maurer, Wallace, S use of degree, 16
Markle, Fletcher, directs M N D for T.V., 33
Marlowe, Christopher, logic of, 36
Marriott, R. B., on S birthplace, 18
Matthews, Harold, Censures Othello, 33
McCollum, W. G., tragedy, 31
McCowan, George, directs Othello, 17
McDonnell, R. F., S use of aspiration, 4
McKenna, Siobhan, as L. Macbeth, 17, 25, 27; as Viola, 17
McKenzie, D. F., on MofV, 23
MEASURE FOR MEASURE, use of color, 24; comedy in, 29; fate of Lucio, 38; at Oregon, 25; plot, 28; politics & power, 11
Mendilow, A. A., death of Falstaff, 38
MERCHANT OF VENICE, crucial song, 32; Jessica & Portia, 8, 13; Irving letters, 1; The Moor, 22; Portia's riddle, 8; printing variants, 23;
Merchant, W. M., illustrations of S, 28
MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR, Conn. Festival, 17
MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, absurdities, 29; at colleges, 15; edition, 6; Garrick's Version 13, 14; Lyly's influence, 35; magic, 22; Memorial Theatre Version, 34; source of, 35; Stratford, England, 33; Texas style, 25;
Mincoff, Marco, S & Lyly, 36
MORE, SIR THOMAS, Mundy as author, 36; text, 21
MUCH ADO, Benedick's song, 8; Boston, 17; Garrick's, 13; on tour, 25
Muir, K., Euphuism of S, 36; on TNK, 22
Musgrove, S., Pistol's character, 32
Music, course in Univ. of Cal., 17; in Eliz, Eng., 4; in romances, 22; in Tempest, 4
Neale, Sir John, Eliz. studies, 10; Tudor heritage, 10
Necker, Madame, on Garrick, 13
Nicoll, Prof. A., Stratford Conf., 33
Norton, Elliot, on Macbeth, 32
Nosworthy, J. M., music in romances, 22
Old Vic., Hamlet on TV, 2; itinerary, 1; use of prop. doll, 4
Oliver, Sir Laurence, acting S in movies, 14
Osborn, J. M., Benedick's song, 8
OTHELLO, Bowdlerized, 31; Christian view of, 3; comedy, 24, 34; fall of, 28; history, 39; Moor in, 22; mythical pattern, 19; Quin in, 6; recording of, 16; Robeson in, 9, 12, 13, 33; Seneca's influence, 40; staging, 28; world view, 4.
PAPP, JOS., N.Y.C. Festival, 17, 25
PERICLES, cycle & crisis, 22
Potts, Abbie F., S. & the "Faerie Queene", 20, 39;
Preva, S., producing S in India, 14
Price, H. T., compositor spellings, 40; S. & his contemporaries, 36
Purcell, J. M., on A. & C., 16
Putney, Rufus, on Falstaff, 5
Quarto, of H. VI, 12
Quintero, Jose, acting and producing Macbeth, 17, 25
Read, Conyers, Eliz. biography, 10
Reed, Robert R., on Hamlet, 28
Reeve, Alex, Texas production of MND, 25
Renaissance Drama Group, 1,
Ribner, Irving, on K.L., 23
RICHARD II, politics, 11
RICHARD III, compared with Macbeth, 19; Hunchback, 4; naturalistic, 31; Rev. of Clemen's RIII, 31; text, 40
Risso, Richard, directs King John, 25
Robeson, Paul, as Othello, 9, 33;
ROMEO AND JULIET, Christian morality, 19; Juliet, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14; metrical spellings, 40; optimism, 3; Plot, 28; at Swan theatre, 30
Rosenberg, Eleanor, Tudor history and literature, 10
Rosenberg, Marvin, bowdlerizing, 31
SANDOE, JAMES, production of T. N., 25
Schoenbaum, Samuel, editing old plays, 1
Seng, P. J., Portia's riddle, 8
Seronsy, Cecil, swearing in K.L., 8
SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM, in Armenia, 14; use of aspiring minds, 4; astrology, 38; Bowdlerized, 31; change of mind, 30; 32; Christian approach to, 3; Christianity, 3; collections, 23, 24; comedy, 4; conditioned by his public's demand, 15; conventional devices, 16; as critic of language, 5; dialect, 40; early contemporaries, 36; early tragic mode, 31; two essentials of S.'s art, 3; Ann Hathaway's cottage, 33; in Hungary, 31; in India, 14; imagery, 30; use of imagination, 8; and Irving, 40; use of Latin, 23; living sources, 14; and Lyly, 36; use of magic, 22; metrical spellings, 40; and Mundy, 36; use of music, 22; oral aspects, 14; as poet of new age, 5; use of politics and power, 11; portrayal of pride, 4; question of illiteracy, 12; relation between his tragedy and society of his time, 4; relics, 18; state of mind of characters, 4; town and country, 31; treatment of patience, 29; treatment of T & C, 3; treatment of Troilus, 3; tragedy, 31; hand in T. N. K., 22; understanding in his own age, 15; experiment in tragedy, 11; youth of, 5;
Shapiro, I. A., S & Mundy, 36
Shaw, George Bernard, on S, 15, 16
Shaw, Glen Byam, leaves Stratford, 33
Sheppard, Sir John, S.'s small Latin, 24
Shoeck, R. J., Tudor period, 1
Siegel, P. N. Cleopatra's death, 24; Eliz. compromise, 4; Othello, 3; R & J, 19
Silverman, A. H., Shaw on S., 16
Sisson, C. J., Petrarchan love, 36; on Prospero, 22
Slack, R. C., color in M for M, 24
Smith, J. H., on Hamlet, 38
Smith, W. D., S's astrology, 28
Snuggs, H. L., plot structure & act division, 30
Soellner, Rolf, on Hercules Furens, 40
Speaight, Robert, S in Colleges, 15; exporting S, 22; politics in S plays, 11
Spencer, B. F., metaphor in A&C, 14
Sprague, A. C., rhythm of S, 36
Staging, Andria, Antony in Monument, 23; Comedy of Errors, 34; Formula, 30; Globe, 3; K. L., 6; K.L. at Globe, 30; Macbeth, 40; Othello, 28; 18th century production records, 4; Othello, 28; R. & J. at Swan, 30;
Stamm, R., middle-class love, 36
Sternfeld, F. W., Lasso's music, 38
Stratford-Upon-Avon, 1; From 1879 to 1959, 2
Stoll, E. E., anachronism in S criticism, 28; on Othello, 39
Stroud, T. A., S's influence on Chekov, 14
TAMING OF THE SHREW, slapstick, 34, 36
TEMPEST, Canadian players, 34; cycle & crisis, 22; divine grace in, 29; magic, 22; use of music, 4, 22; power, 11; Prospero, 11; 13, 15, 23; words of, 32;
Thompson, K. F., variant readings of T & C, 4
Thompson, Sir E. M., Eliz. handwriting, 21
Thorp, Margaret, S in movies, 14
TITUS ANDRONICUS, Lavinia, 8; least plausible, 12; metrical spellings, 40, naturalistic speech, 31
Traversi, Derek, RII to HV, 22
TROILUS & CRESSIDA, Chaucer, 3; political outlook, 11; recording of, 16; Ulysses' speech on degree, 16; variant reading, 4
TWELFTH NIGHT, at Boston Arts Center, 17; love in, 29, Malvolio, 8, 24; Player's Inc. production, 2
TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA, as farce, 2; Proteus, 29
TWO NOBLE KINSMAN, printer's copy, 23 S's hand in, 22
Ure, Mary, as Titania, 33
Virtue, John, on Polonius, 8
Wadsworth, F. W., "Poacher from Stratford", 20, 39
Waller, F. O., printer's copy of TNK, 23
Walton, J. K., RIII Quarto, 40
Wanamaker, Sam, as Iago, 9, 33
Weisinger, Herbert, S. myth, 19
West, R. H., sex and pessimism in Lear, 5
Williams, G. W., R & J at Swan, 30; setting by formes, 23
Willcock, G. D., S as language critic, 5
Wilson, F. P., satirical prints, 22
Wilson, Harold S., on criticism, 3
Wilson, J. D., S for lay readers, 21
WINTER'S TALE, cycle & crisis, 22; divine grace in, 29; euphuism, 36; language, 5; music & magic, 22; Perdita, 8, 15; stagecraft, 15;
Wood, Peter, as director, 17
Woodruff, Neal Jr., Cymbeline, 16
Worth, Irene, in Othello, 18; as Rosalind, 33
Wright, L. B., on critical obscurantists, 2; Folger library, 2; opportunities for study of Stuart & Tudor history, 10

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

Barbara Alden; Michael Salamo, Brooklyn College; Marvin Spevack, City College (N.Y.); Joseph H. Summerell, N.Y. State University, Plattsburg; Margaret Lee Wiley, Arlington State College; George W. Williams, Duke.

HAMLET'S WORLD

Disagreeing with Mr. Eliot's judgement that **Hamlet** is incoherent, Barbara Deming writes that Hamlet himself, along with the rest of the dramatis personae, "is shown us, within the drastic situation posed, with heart refusing to accept the given facts . . . . And we see one character after another in the act of willing . . . to take way Fortune's all too real power." The major protests against fact are those of Hamlet and Claudius, the one objecting to the existence of evil, specifically the evil state of Denmark consequent upon Claudius' crimes of murder and incest, the other that he cannot enjoy the fruits of his evil undisturbed by conscience and the threat of vengeance that "he cannot call it by some other name." Polonius refuses to acknowledge that he is helpless to manipulate the younger generation as represented by Hamlet, while Ophelia and the Queen cannot "accept the fact that opposing loyalties," Ophelia's to her father and Hamlet, Gertrude's to Hamlet and Claudius, "involve one in choices." All these are perverse gestures, and all the characters who make them are destroyed.

Hamlet's protest differs from the others in that his is directed against something "essentially outrageous," though the manner of the protest involves him in irrational actions, such as his device of the play and his response to the result. He also irrationally protests against his human lack of knowledge and control of his deepest being, which comes out in the soliloquies of self-reproach. But Miss Deming does not agree with Dr. Ernest Jones that Hamlet is sick enough to need a Freudian analysis, since Hamlet perceives the objective reality of Denmark and Claudius, its usurping King, and in many scenes, with the actors, with Osric, with the gravediggers, observes reality agreeably to his dignity as Prince of Denmark. He may not like either the inner or the outer truths about himself, but he does not, like the other characters, disregard them, and boldly sees and bears witness to the unlovely when it confronts him. His growth in self-knowledge especially makes him heroic; his changed perspective is especially remarkable after his return from the voyage, when he challenges Claudius, and when he moves with almost an ease through the final scenes, so that he succeeds in winning over Laertes and in destroying the King. In **Hamlet,** Shakespeare shows the human protest against "outrageous Fortune" in "a man at his most helpless, so constricted by circumstance and by his own nature . . . that it has made him almost mad and he can at first only strike out blindly, and without control, disastrously harming those he loves as often as his enemies; but in the course of the play, that protest grows less blind, less vain." [**Tulane Drama Review,** IV:2 (December 1959), 36-44]

BOTTOM'S DREAM

"The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report, what my dream was." T. M. Pearce of the University of New Mexico corrects Halliwell-Phillipps' note to **A Midsummer Night's Dream,** IV. 1, 214-15, suggesting that this set of paradoxes does not echo similar passages in **Selinus** and **Wily Beguiled,** but parodies St. Paul's words in **I Corinthians,** II, 9. This intentional echo Shakespeare uses to suggest that "'man is but a patched fool' if he believes that he knows only through his senses instead of through the secret ways of the spirit." [**The Explicator,** XVIII,No. 1 (October 1959), 8]

SHAKESPEARE STRUCTURAL

Professor Harry R. Warfel of the University of Florida, co-author of **American English in Its Cultural Setting** (1956), has another explanation of the poetic genius that is Shakespeare's:

"Because there is no one way of saying anything, the poet is the person who is delegated to discover the best way or ways. To do so he must know the structure of his native language and its operations, its system of sounds and intonation patterns, and its vocabulary. In addition, he must know the structural patterns of logic and rhetoric as they relate to the art form of poetry.

"Only Shakespeare stands unmistakably the equal of Poe in these matters. Dryden almost equals Poe, but Dryden tended to disparage the English language as a poetic medium in contrast with Greek and Latin. Dryden was petulant whenever he thought of the necessity to use, as we all must, the three hundred recurring structure words: **a, an, the, at, can, when,** etc. Shakespeare and Poe consistently manipulated their artistic effects to subordinate these words that constitute the most important machinery of the language." ["The Mathematics of Poe's Poetry," **The CEA Critic,** XXXI (May 1959), 1,5.]

AN INTRODUCTION TO SHAKESPEARE

By Hardin Craig

Eight Plays and Twenty-one Sonnets

Romeo and Juliet, King Richard the Second, King Henry the Fourth, Much Ado About Nothing, Twelfth Night, Hamlet, King Lear, The Tempest.

INCLUDES a general introduction, an introduction to each play, bibliographies, and footnotes.

452 pages $2.85 list

SCOTT FORESMAN & COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto

Fair Lawn, N. J.

A SHREW AND THE SHREW AGAIN

Mr. John W. Shroeder suggests modestly that scholarship has not yet solved the problem of the relationship of **A Shrew** and **The Shrew.** He examines first the theory advanced by Samuel Hickson (1850) and supported by Peter Alexander (1926) that **The Shrew** is original and **A Shrew** a piracy, and he concludes that the evidence does not sustain the thesis. He next studies the theory of Raymond Houk (1947) that the two plays have a common original, and again he finds the argument inconclusive. Finally he recommends a return to the old theory that **A Shrew** is the original and **The Shrew** a Shakespearean reworking. He bases his recommendations on the presence of Marlovian verse in **A Shrew** and its faint echoes in **The Shrew.** He argues that the easiest line of conjecture is this: "the order of composition is straightforward, the author of **A Shrew** borrowing with minor changes Marlowe's lines and Shakespeare in his own turn working later with a dim recollection of both Marlowe and **A Shrew** in his head." ["**The Taming of A Shrew** and **The Taming of the Shrew:** A Case Reopened," **Journal of English and Germanic Philology,** LVII (July 1958), 424-443.]

"MR. W. H." NOT WILLIAM HERBERT

William Herbert, the third Earl of Pembroke, has long been a "possible candidate for the conjectured youth of the sonnets," his initials being indentical with the "Mr. W. H." of the 1609 quarto. Partisans of this theory, inaugurated by James Boaden in 1832, have tarnished Pembroke's reputation "with charges of the grossest immorality," lowered his dignity, impugned his integrity, "besmirched and bemeaned" him in a way "which would have astonished and shocked his contemporaries . . . ." Because of the "presumably loose morals" of the young man of the sonnets, who on the basis of 1-17 seems to have been "strongly averse" to marriage, the Pembroke theorists have developed from contemporary documents a corresponding portrait of the young Lord Herbert. Dick Taylor, Jr., of Tulane, describes his chief purpose as the rehabilitation of Pembroke's reputation, but suggests "it might be of some interest to Shakespeare studies finally to lay the ghost of the Pembroke theory."

The "actual character" of Pembroke as revealed by a documentary record of his activities between 1595-1604 "differs sharply from the artificial character" ascribed to him by those who see him as the youth of the sonnets. He was in real life "ambitious, pushing, active," and "almost fanatically" determined on a courtier's career. Because in contemporary records Herbert's name is mentioned in connection with four proposed marriages, none of which materialized, sonnets 1-17 "have been construed as poems written . . . to persuade the irresponsible . . . youth to take life seriously and get married." Taylor believes Herbert "was in no way responsible" for the failure of these matches, and that there is "no similarity between him and the youth of sonnets 1-17 in his alleged reluctance to marry." Taylor concludes that Herbert "in no way resembled any of the several youths who might be extracted from the sonnets as they were printed in 1609."

["The Earl of Pembroke and the Youth of Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Essay in Rehabilitation," **Studies in Philology,** LVI:1 (January, 1959), 26-54.]